REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response, these claims are amended herein for definiteness.

Claims 13-15, 17-19, 21-24 and 26-30 stand rejected under 35 USC 102b as allegedly being anticipated by Dietz. In order to obviate this rejection, claim 19 is amended to include the limitations of claim 20 therein and also to include additional subject matter. (Claim 20 is now amended to recite different subject matter.)

Claim 24 is analogously amended to similarly include the limitations of previous claim 25 therein.

Claim 13 is amended to recite additional subject matter that is not disclosed or otherwise made obvious from Dietz.

The subject matter of claims 19 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Dietz in view of Bouet. This contention is respectfully traversed with reference to the currently-presented claims

Dietz describes a system in which a user can carry out text based operations such as text-to-speech in a client/server configuration. The I/O device 201 receives voice information, and sends that information to a server 200 to that carries out processing of the information. Dietz describes that one of sources of processing may be a language transition website, see for example column 6 lines 1-5.

Bouet simply describes a Bluetooth system, and how Bluetooth can be used to control over or between a number of terminals.

However, claim 19 as amended to include the limitations of claim 20 therein defines that the connection is a Bluetooth connection to a locally located device that is not accessed over the Internet. With all due respect, Dietz teaches away from this kind of connection, and therefore the combination of Dietz with Bouet is respectfully suggested to be an improper combination.

Dietz describes a client/server communication system, in which information is sent to a remote processor. Dietz describes how the voice communication can be processed in many ways, including using language translation websites such as www.altavista.com. While Dietz does contemplate the network could be a local network, he also contemplates that additional information for that network be accessible over the internet.

Amended claim 19 is entirely different, however, since it defines a short range Bluetooth connection to a device that is not accessed over the Internet to receive the data. The spoken voice and the recognized text are sent over the Bluetooth connection. Claim 19 further defines that the computer includes a telephone herein and that the Bluetooth connection is used for both things communication over the telephone, and also for communicating the spoken voice and recognized text. That is, according to claim 19, the Bluetooth network uses the same connection that is used for voice communication is also used for sending the data connection.

Nothing in Dietz in view of Bouet describes such a short range network where the network is used both for communicating over the telephone and also for sending the

spoken voice and recognized text over the Bluetooth connection. That is, according to claim 19, the same connection that is used for voice communication is also used for sending this data connection.

Nothing in Dietz suggests that the same short range network is used both for communicating over the telephone and also for sending the spoken voice and recognized text over the Bluetooth connection.

Bouet shows a Bluetooth connection, but does not describe the specific subject matter now described, nor does it describe that both communication and also voice recognition can be controlled over the same Bluetooth network.

Moreover, Dietz is respectfully suggested to teach away from a short range Bluetooth connection of the type now claimed.

Neither reference describes or otherwise contemplates the unexpected advantage that the same communication line that creates or the same communication network that carries the voice information also carries the voice recognition information. Claim 19 should be allowable for these reasons.

Claim 20 defines a new aspect, that the first computer stores plural different contact information for plural different contacts and that the recognized text is constrained to be one of those contacts. This produces an additional advantage of simplifying the text recognition by making it always one of those contacts. This defines subject matter that is not in any way suggested by the prior art.

Claim 24 should be allowable for analogous reasons to those discussed above with respect to claim 19. Specifically, claim 24 defines a Bluetooth part that connects to a locally located device not accessed over the Internet to receive or process the data, and that the Bluetooth is used for both voice communication and also for voice recognition communication. Such is in no way taught or suggested by the scope and contents of the cited prior art, as described above.

Claim 25 defines that the computer stores plural different contacts and that the information is always one of those contacts. As described above, this is not disclosed or otherwise made obvious by the cited prior art.

Claim 13 has been amended to include similar limitations to those now defined in claims 20 and 25. Specifically, claim 13 is amended to recite that the electronically operated device stores plural different contact information and that the recognized voice information is recognized only as being one of the stored contact information. Such is in no way disclosed or otherwise made obvious by the cited prior art.

All of the claims should be allowable for these reasons.

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully suggested that all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is hence respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that communications such as a telephone interview or email would facilitate disposal of this case, the undersigned respectfully encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by

electronic mail (using the email address scott@harrises.com). I understand that a copy

of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this response to Deposit Account

No. 50-1387(small entity).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: __ 8/31/2009___   __/Scott C Harris/_____
                                                          Scott C. Harris
                                                          Reg. No. 32,030

Customer No. 23844
Scott C. Harris, Esq.
P.O. Box 927649
San Diego, CA 92192
Telephone: (619) 823-7778
Facsimile: (858) 756-7717